/44 cont./

59 so great, and there are, besides the linear families or nonnamed minimal lineages, some independent families (i.e., rather Ll, often Ss and In, instead of Ee; column 7), which agrees with the fact that, besides the customary matrilocal marriage, "neolocal" residence is found (Mn, instead of Mm; column 8) in the dry season on the one hand, and, on the other hand, as a possible
595 nucleus of a new extended family. Polygyny is neither frequent
583 nor favored, whereas it is true that material considerations are absent on the occasion of marriage (thus Mo or To rather than Lo; column 9).

611 We shall now take up the most confused aspect of Carajá
[121] ethnography. The Handbook of South American Indians speaks
615 correctly of double descent. I have shown elsewhere that be-
[114] cause of some inattention in the editing of the famous manual, an incorrect idea of the real nature of this coexistence of patrilineal and matrilineal groupings has arisen. It is a matter, not of moieties, but of three large, named, patrilineal groups, which are primarily the men's affair, in their ceremonial and political life, but nevertheless are concerned with women in the sense of an endogamous tendency. Thus it is not a matter of true parallel descent, and, on the other hand, it is by no
[621] means a question of exogamy, and still less of moieties. At the most one may speak of nonexogamy or agamy as in the case of the villages, which are themselves matrilineal groupings on account of the matrilocal rule of the domestic group just men-
613 tioned. In a strict sense only the small extended family,
596 which can be described as a non-named, minimal, matrilineal
582 lineage, seems to be exogamous. Marriage is permitted with any cousin, parallel or cross, and the matrilateral preference reported by Lipkind (incidentally without any indication of whether it is a matter of parallel or cross cousins!) seems to be only the normative expression of matrilocal marriage, whereas the slight patrilateral preference ascertained by myself is equally in agreement with the rule of endogamy of the patrilineal groups.
[601] In reality, since the relatives are usually "brother" and "sister" with regard to each other, being male and female cousin, as we

/45 cont./

601 the children of their sister "nephew-niece" (without distinction as to sex). This only makes sense if one wishes to emphasize, along with the unity of the brothers and sisters, the unity of a patrilineal minimal lineage, the children of a sister then belonging to another small exogamic patrilineal group. Now, at present, there is no patrilineal lineage. This would allow us to suppose an historic change from a patrilineal preponderance to a matrilineal preponderance, a change which would be expressed today in double descent. The kinship system which most emphasizes the unity of patrilineal lineage /46/ (of the mother) is the "Omaha" system, which, moreover, one could imagine as structured according to the principle of the classificatory unity of brothers and sisters, which is never the case so far as I know, but which would push the logic of this system to the extreme (the same statement would be valid for the "Crow" system, which marks the unity of the matrilineal lineage, this time of the father).

551 601 Now, brothers-in-law and sisters-in-law (as well as parents-in-law) are classified by "teknonymy," and since in the designation the reference "...of my child" seems to be customarily omitted, this is the same, for the husbands, as the way in which, in the "Omaha" system, the men designate their matrilateral male and female cross-cousins, and for the wives, as the manner of designation used by the women in the "Crow" system, when it is a matter of their patrilateral male and female cousins. I wonder whether there is not a connection between teknonymy in the broad sense and the types produced by linear or consecutive classification.

Teknonymy in the restricted sense, i.e., the terms "lord of so-and-so" and "source of so-and-so" used by a third person, is voluntarily chosen by the parents themselves. "Source of the grandchild" is the daughter-in-law, whereas the son-in-law is called "black-nephew" (the speech of the man being borrowed, this time, by his wife!). This would again be in accord with a historic state of patrilineal preponderance, if one does not